



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

A DECREE IN HONOR OF ARTEMIDORUS<sup>1</sup>

---

THE inscription which forms the subject of the present paper is recorded on a block of Hymettian marble, and was found in a mediaeval wall northeast of the Propylaea on the Acropolis at Athens (wall marked 5, Plate 1, Cavvadias und Kawerau, *Die Ausgrabung der Akropolis*). The stone is broken on all sides, except for a small portion on the right. The inscribed surface is 0.41 m. long on the left, 0.46 m. on the right, and 0.23 m. wide. The block varies in thickness from 0.14 m. at the base to 0.115 m. at the top. The letters which are 0.005 m. high and spaced 0.01 m. apart, are written *stoichedon*. When the stone was removed from the wall, the letters were completely filled with a deposit of lime from the cement mortar. Water had worked its way across the top and the right side, corroding the surface so badly that these portions of the inscription were almost entirely undecipherable. The deposit of lime on the soft and corroded surface made the task of cleaning most difficult. The reading of the inscription was further complicated by the numerous faults and seams in the surface of the stone.

A photograph (Fig. 1), the text printed in capitals, and the text with restorations are given here in succession.

<sup>1</sup> This inscription is now published by Kirchner as *I.G.* II<sup>2</sup>, 663. The document was found while I was a member of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens in the winter of 1910, and this paper was prepared in that year. I am under many obligations to Mr. Hill, director of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens, and to the Greek officials, especially Messrs. Skias and Leonardos, for facilitating my harmless operations as *τοιχωγράφος* on the Acropolis, and my researches in the Epigraphical Museum at Athens. Professor Chase has given me no little help by thoroughly revising the manuscript of this paper, and in the whole series of papers of which this is the third and last Professor Fowler has generously given of his time and labor in correcting mistakes in manuscript and proof.



FIGURE 1.—DECREE IN HONOR OF ARTEMIDORUS



TEXT

/ Ε  
 Ι Α Ξ  
 Ι Λ Υ Ξ Ι /  
 Η Ν Α Ι Ω Ν Κ Α Ι  
 5     \ Ε Μ Ρ /   Τ Ι Κ Α Ι Ρ  
 Ι Υ Γ Ε Ρ Τ Ο Υ Δ Η Μ Ο \  
 Α Ι Κ Α Ι Τ Α Ι Ξ Ρ Ρ Ε Ξ Β Ε  
 Λ Λ Ο Μ Ε Ν Α Ι Ξ Ρ Ρ Ο Ξ Τ Ο Ν  
 Ξ Τ Α Ι Ε Ι Ξ Ο Τ Ι Α Ν Α Υ Τ  
 10     Ε Ι Α Γ Α Θ Ε Ι Δ Ε Δ Ο Χ  
 Ρ Ο Ε Δ Ρ Ο Υ Ξ Ο Ι Τ Ι Ν Ε  
 Ν Τ Ω Ι Δ Η Μ Ω Ι Ε Ι Ξ Τ Η  
 Χ Ρ Η Μ Α Τ Ι Ξ Α Ι Ρ Ε Ρ  
 Ξ Υ \ Β Α Λ Λ Ε Ξ Θ Α Τ Η Ξ Β Ο \     \ Η  
 15     Γ Ι Δ Ο Κ Ε Ι Τ Ε Ι Β Ο Υ Λ Ε   Ε  
 Ξ Μ Ι Δ Ω Ρ Ο Ν Α Ρ Ο Λ Λ Ο Δ Ω Ρ   Υ  
 Ξ Τ Η Ξ Ε Ν Ε Κ Α Κ Α Ι Ε Υ Ν Ο Ι   Ξ  
 \ Ξ Ι Λ Ε Α Λ Υ Ξ Ι Μ Α Χ Ο Ν Κ Α   Ρ  
 Τ Ο Ν Α Θ Η Ν Α Ι Ω Ν Κ Α Ι Ξ Τ Ε  
 20     Ξ Τ Ε Φ Α Ν Ω Ι Κ Α Τ Α Τ Ο Ν Ν Ο Μ Ο  
 Ν Α Θ Η Ν Α Ι Ο Ν Κ Α Ι Τ Ο Υ   Ε Κ  
 < Α Ι Γ Ρ Α Υ Α Ξ Θ Α Ι Φ Υ Λ Η Ξ Κ Α  
 Ρ Ι Α Ξ Η Ξ Α Ν Β Ο Υ Λ Η Τ Α Ι Κ  
 Υ Ξ Δ Ε Ρ Ρ Υ Τ Α Ν Ε Ι Ξ   Ο Υ Ξ  
 25     Τ Ο Υ Μ Ο Υ Ν Ι Χ Ι Ω Ν Ο Ξ \ Η Ν  
 Γ Α Υ Τ Ο Υ Τ Η Ν Ψ Η Φ Ο Ν Ε Ι Ξ Τ Η  
 Η Ξ Ι Α Ν Κ Α Ι     Θ Ε Ξ / Ο Ο Ε  
 Ι Ν Α Υ Τ Ω Ι     Ι Α  
 < Ι Ν Τ Α Δ Η Μ Ο     Ι     Ι     Ι     Ι Ρ  
 30     Λ Λ Ο Ν Η Ι Γ Α Ξ Ι Χ Ρ Ε Ι  
 Η Μ Ω Ι Ε Ι Δ Ο Τ Α Ξ Ο Τ Ι  
 Ξ Α Τ Α Ξ Ι Α Ξ Τ Ω Ν Ε Υ =  
 Ψ Α Ι Δ Ε Τ Ο Δ Ε Τ Ο Υ  
 Α Τ Ο Ν Κ Α Τ Α Ρ Ρ Υ Τ Α Ν  
 35     Ι Ν Ε Ι Κ Α Ι Ξ Τ Η Ξ Α Ι Ε Ν Α Γ /  
 Ν Α Ν Α Γ Ρ Α Φ Η Ν Τ Η Ξ Ξ Τ Η /  
 < Ε Ρ Ι Τ Η Ι Δ Ι Ο Ι Κ Η Ξ Ε Ι

NOTE.—Letters marked with a point beneath are very obscure on the stone.

In the first line there is a very faint trace of a sloping *hasta* which would be a part of an A or Λ or M and lines which may be a part of an E or Ξ. Since no restoration seems to fit such a combination of letters, these marks may be due solely to corrosion by water. In line 2 the first letter has the form ϛ on the stone, but the spacing is against regarding this as a *nu*. It must be *iota*, and the second and third *hastae* are due to seams on the surface of the stone. Similarly in line 4, the letter following *καί* appears as Π. It is impossible to determine which of these strokes, if any, belong to the original letter. We may exclude T or Γ, since the restoration with either of these letters is difficult and improbable. It is quite possible that the correct reading is E. At the beginning of line 5, the slanting *hasta* of the final A in βασιλέα is clear. The first letter in line 6 is uncertain, but it is probably *iota* as that letter suits the spacing best. In line 16 the first letter appears on the stone as Ξ. This is the right half of an E, and the vertical bar on the right is a seam in the stone. In line 14 the final *iota* of the infinitive has been omitted by the stonecutter, a lipography probably due to the following *tau*. In line 29 the twelfth letter can only be the bottom stroke of Δ, E, I or Ξ; the thirteenth may be I, T or Y; the fourteenth may be Γ, K Γ or P. The upper half of the right *hasta* of H before the P at the end of the line is still preserved. At the end of line 35 there is a sloping *hasta* which must belong to Λ, unless it is a fault in the surface of the stone. In line 37 the first letter is undoubtedly Ξ, as the ends of the sloping outer bars still remain on the stone.

## TEXT WITH RESTORATIONS

- ὁ δέῖνα . . . . .  
 . . . . . εἶπεν ἑπειδὴ Ἀρτεμίδωρο-  
 s . . . . . ἐμπίσται καὶ φίλῳ ὦν β-  
 ασιλέως Λυσιμάχου καὶ ἀποστελλόμε-  
 1 νος ὑπὸ τοῦ βασιλέως Λυσιμάχου πρὸς  
 τὸν δῆμον κατὰ τὰς πρεσβε[ί]ας [εὐνοια-  
 ν ἐνδείκνυται τῷ βασιλεῖ] Λυσ[ιμάχ]-  
 ι καὶ τῷ δήμῳ τῷ Ἀθηναίων καὶ [ . . . .  
 5 . . . . . s τὸν βασιλέα ] ἐμ π[αν]τὶ καὶ ρῶ . .  
 . . . . . ] ὑπὲρ τοῦ δήμο[υ] ἀγα-  
 θὸν ὅ,τι ἂν δύνηται καὶ ταῖς πρεσβε[ί]α-

- ις ταῖς ἀποστειλλομέναις πρὸς τὸν [βα-  
 σιλέα συναγων(ι)ζ]εται εἰς ὅ,τι ἂν αὐτ[ὸν  
 10 παρακαλῶσιν· τύχ]ει ἀγαθῇ δεδόχθ[αι  
 τῇ βουλῇ τοὺς π]ροέδρους οὔτινε[ς ἄ-  
 ν προεδρεύωσιν ἐ]ν τῷ δήμῳ εἰς τῇ[ν π-  
 ρώτην ἐκκλησίαν] χρηματίσαι περ[ὶ αὐ-  
 τοῦ, γνώμην δὲ ]συμβάλλεσθα(ι) τῆς βο[ουλῆ-  
 15 ς εἰς τὸν δῆμον ὅ]τι δοκεῖ τῇ βουλῇ[ι] ἐ-  
 [παινέσαι Ἄρτε]μίδωρον Ἄπολλοδώρ[ο]ν  
 [ . . . . . ἄρ]ετ[ῆς] ἕνεκα καὶ εὐνοί[α]ς  
 [τῆς πρὸς τὸν βα]σιλέα Λυσίμαχον καὶ π-  
 [ρὸς τὸν δῆμον] τὸν Ἀ[θ]ηναίων καὶ στε[φ]α-  
 20 νῶσαι χρυσῷ] στεφάνῳ κατὰ τὸν νόμο-  
 [ν, εἶναι δὲ αὐτῶ]ν Ἀθηναίων καὶ τοῦ[ς] ἐκ-  
 [γόνους αὐτοῦ] καὶ γράψασθαι φυλῆς κα-  
 [ὶ δήμου καὶ φρατ]ρίας ἧς ἂν βούληται κ-  
 [ατὰ τὸν νόμον, το]ὺς δὲ πρυτάνεις [τ]οὺς  
 25 [πρυτανεύοντας] τοῦ Μουνιχιῶνος [μ]ην-  
 [ὸς δοῦναι περ]ὶ αὐτοῦ τὴν ψῆφον εἰ[ς] τῇ-  
 [ν πρώτην ἐκκλ]ησίαν κα[ὶ τοὺς] θεσ[μ]οθέ-  
 [τας εἰσαγαγ]εῖν αὐτῷ [τὴν δοκιμασ]ία-  
 [ν ὅταν πληρῶσ]ιν τὰ δημόσι[α δικαστή]ρ-  
 30 [ια ὅπως ἐφάμ]ιλλον ἢ πᾶσι χρει[ας παρ-  
 ἔ]χεσθαι τῷ δήμῳ εἰδότες ὅτι [κομιο-  
 ὦνται χάριτα]ς [κ]αταξίας τῶν εὐ[εργετ-  
 ημάτων· ἀναγρά]ψαι δὲ τόδε τὸ ψ[ή]φισμα  
 τὸν γραμματέ[α τὸν κατὰ πρυταν]είαν ἐ-  
 35 ν στήλῃ λιθ[ίνει] καὶ στήσαι ἐν Ἀγλ[αύ-  
 ρου· εἰς δὲ τῇ]ν ἀναγραφὴν τῆς στή[λης μ-  
 ερίσαι τοὺς] ἐπὶ τῇ διοικήσει.

The restorations in this inscription have been made with the aid of the formulae usual in decrees granting citizenship. The first few lines, however, have nothing in common with this class of inscriptions, and diverge considerably from the usual phraseology. In inscriptions of this type, the formulae grow steadily more elaborate during the Hellenistic period, while the value of the honor steadily declines. There is a striking similarity in this decree to *I. G. II<sup>2</sup>, 662*, which is also very fragmentary. Both seem to deal with the same subject and to be worded exactly alike. Both were passed on the same day and it is



of the opening formula similar to that of *I.G.* II<sup>2</sup>, 662. The only combination which corresponds to any of the suggested readings is the following:

[ἐπειδὴ Ἀρτεμίδωρος . . . . . ἔμ  
[πίστει καὶ φιλῖαι ἐστὶ τῷ βασι]λε[ῖ Λυσι-]  
[μάχῳ καὶ κατὰ τὰς πρεσβε]ίας [εὐνοίαν]  
[ἐνδείκνυται τῷ βασιλεῖ] Λυσι[μάχῳ καὶ ]  
[τῷ δήμῳ τῷ Ἀθηναίων κτλ].

This restoration is quite different from that of *I.G.* II<sup>2</sup>, 662, but since the remainder of the latter inscription so closely resembles *I.G.* II<sup>2</sup>, 663, it is quite possible that we should reject the suggested reading in line 1 of *I.G.* II<sup>2</sup> 663, and make the same restoration as in the other.

The name of the king, Lysimachus, which is to be restored in line 2 from line 17, gives an important clue to the date of the document. Friendly relations between the Athenians and Lysimachus existed only in the years 301/0—294/5 and 288/7—282/1 B.C. (Cf. Ferguson, *Hellenistic Athens*, p. 147, note 1: Tarn, *Antigonos Gonatas*, p. 101.) This document must, therefore, be placed within these limits.

The phrase κατὰ τὰς πρεσβείας is also restored in *I.G.* II<sup>2</sup>, 662. κατὰ must have the meaning "in regard to" or "in connection with." This use is very common in the formula ἐκ τῶν εἰς τὰ κατὰ ψηφίσματα ἀναλίσκομένων τῷ δήμῳ (*I.G.* II<sup>2</sup>, 106, *et passim*) and sometimes in regard to religious ceremonies as τῶν κατὰ τὴν θεόν (*I.G.* II, 5, 618 b.) and τὰ κατὰ τὰς θυσίας (Dittenberger, *S.I.G.*<sup>2</sup> II, 927) but the preposition does not occur elsewhere in Attic inscriptions in this combination. The restoration [με]τὰ τὰς πρεσβείας while easier to explain from a syntactical point of view, does not accord with the use of the present tense throughout the preamble.

The use of the plural τὰς πρεσβείας points to several embassies. It is known that Philippides went up to the court of Lysimachus in 299/8 B.C., when he secured a gift of corn for Athens and also a mast and sail for the Panathenaic procession (*I.G.* II<sup>2</sup>, 657). It is uncertain whether these gifts were obtained as a result of one or more visits. Demochares went at least twice to the same court, receiving at one time thirty, and at another one hundred talents of silver (Pseudo-Plutarch, *Vitae X Oratorum*, 851 E, καὶ πρεσβέσαντι πρὸς Λυσίμαχον καὶ λαβόντι τῷ



δήμῳ τριάκοντα τάλαντα ἀργυρίου καὶ πάλιν ἕτερα ἑκατόν). The embassies of Demochares were sent apparently *ca.* 288/7 B.C., not long after his restoration (Tarn, *Antigonos Gonatas* pp. 92 ff., 416 ff). If we are correct in dating *I.G.* II<sup>2</sup>, 662 in the archonship of Diocles, there can be no doubt that these embassies relate in some way to those of Demochares in the same year.

In restoring lines 1-2, the new inscription furnishes καὶ while *I.G.* II<sup>2</sup>, 662 gives . . ]ς τὸν βασιλέα. If we combine the two, there are still nine letters to be restored in the new decree and ten in *I.G.* II<sup>2</sup>, 662. The letter following καὶ in the new inscription is doubtful, but may be either Ε, Τ or Π. None of the usual formulae apply in any case. It is possible that we should restore [ἐπαν(ι)ῶν πρό]ς or [ἐπανιῶν εἰ]ς in this decree and [καὶ ἐπανιῶν πρό]ς or [υ<sup>1</sup> . καὶ ἐπανιῶν εἰ]ς in *I.G.* II<sup>2</sup>, 662. If the restoration ἀποστελλόμενος is correct, it is clear that some word implying the return of Artemidorus to the royal court is necessary. The restoration ἀνελθὼν πρὸς, which would fill the gap, does not seem consistent with the use of the present participle ἀποστελλόμενος, nor does it accord with the apparent traces of letters on the stone. ἐπανιῶν is not elsewhere found in the Attic ψηφίσματα, but it is difficult to find any other restoration which gives a satisfactory meaning.

In lines 4-5 a word or phrase of sixteen letters is required. The *lacuna* in *I. G.* II<sup>2</sup>, 662, line 11, is of the same length. The usual formula with ὑπὲρ τοῦ δήμου is λέγει καὶ πράττει or λέγων καὶ πράττων (*I.G.* II<sup>2</sup>, 498, 650, etc.), but these phrases have only fifteen letters each. Since it is very unlikely that one space would have been left unfilled in both inscriptions, some other formula must be restored. In the new inscription there are indications which lead us to believe that the phrase ended in the letter *iota*. If a verb is used in the phrase, it must be in the present tense to conform with συναγωνίζεται in line 9. Perhaps we should restore φροντίζων διατελεῖ (cf. *I.G.* II<sup>2</sup>, 786).

In lines 5-6 there is a difference of one space in the *lacuna*, as compared with the corresponding lines in *I.G.* II<sup>2</sup>, 662. The phrase ἀγαθὸν ὅτι ἂν δύνηται is undoubtedly the correct restoration in the new inscription. In *I.G.* II<sup>2</sup>, 662 we may either restore a different combination or else assume that one space was left

<sup>1</sup> υ . = one space vacant. It may be noted that the stonecutter in *I.G.* II<sup>2</sup>, 662 apparently left one space vacant between clauses and sentences for punctuation.

vacant as a mark of punctuation. The latter is more probable as such appears to be the practice in this inscription.

In line 9 the *stoichedon* arrangement of the letters has not been kept in the first part of the line, or else the stonecutter has omitted one letter. In line 14 we have another example of the careless workmanship on this stone. As the letter *iota* was omitted in the latter case, we should probably read *συναγων(ι)ζεται* in the former, assuming that the stonecutter confused the letter with the straight vertical hasta of the preceding *nu*, while in line 18 his eye was caught by the following *tau*.

L. 10. The use of the old Attic forms in the dative singular of the first declension is found consistently in this decree in established formulas as *ἀγαθῇ τύχει*, *ἔδοξεν τῇ βουλῇ* and the like. This is due to a fondness for archaisms which sprang up in the fourth century (Schwyzer-Meisterhans, *Grammatik der Attischen Inschriften*, p. 39). It does not extend, however, to formulae which came into use after 400 B.C., cf. *ἐπὶ τῇ διοικήσει* (line 37).

L. 11. *οἵτινες ἀνπροεδρεύουσιν*. This variant of the usual formula is found nowhere else in the Attic decrees, although almost all the possible varieties of syntactical construction are known (Larfeld, *Handbuch der Griechischen Epigraphik*, II, pp. 667 ff.).

L. 17. The *demotikon* of Artemidorus must consist of nine letters. We are probably justified in limiting his home to the vicinity of Asia Minor or Macedonia. The words *Λυσιμαχέα*, or *Σμυρναῖον* are of the requisite length. The latter is probably the correct restoration, for we know that Lysimachus rebuilt the city of Smyrna and must, therefore, have had a great personal interest in its people. Moreover, the names Artemidorus and Apollodorus appear on coins in Smyrna as magistrates of that city in the second century (Mionnet, *Description de Médailles antiques grecques et romaines*, Vol. III, pp. 192-3). Artemidorus, who evidently was in high favor at court, may have persuaded the king to restore his native city, and he was probably the founder of the family which later gave these two magistrates to the new city. *I.G.* II, 5, 3362 b. is a gravestone found in the Piraeus with the inscription *Ἀπολλόδωρος Σμυρναῖος*.

L. 20. The formula *κατὰ τὸν νόμον* in connection with crowns is not found before 303/2 B.C. when it supplants the former custom of naming the value of the crown. Apparently in this year or in the period of the "Four Years' War" a law was passed regulating their value and establishing a fixed price.

Owing to the unsatisfactory state of the Athenian treasury at this time, the value could not have been a high one (Schmitt-henner, *De Coronarum apud Athenienses Honoribus*, p. 19, Tod, *B.S.A.* 1903, pp. 165 ff.). It should be noted that most of the crowns given between 306/5 and 303/2 B.C. were of olive (*I.G.* II<sup>2</sup>, 479, 483, 487).

In determining the date of this inscription I undertook a study of the formulae used in granting citizenship to aliens, and the results are given in part in the notes on the following lines. Although I have not carried the study beyond the year 282 B.C., the variations in the phraseology of the formulae seem to be closely connected with the various political changes of the times, and an investigation of the later history of the formula should be of value, not only in studying the shift of political parties, but also in dating inscriptions of the third and second centuries B.C.

Ll. 22-23. When decrees conferring citizenship first appear in the Athenian documents, the choice of tribe, deme and phratry was unrestricted, and the new citizen enrolled himself as he pleased. The formula γράψασθαι (ἐλέσθαι) φυλῆς καὶ δήμου καὶ φρατρίας ἧς ἂν βούληται remains constant in all inscriptions of the fourth century until ca. 334 B.C. There is one exception. The Samians (*I.G.* II<sup>2</sup>, 1) are distributed in equal numbers amongst the ten tribes. It is apparent in their case that this division was required so that they could not acquire undue political influence in any one tribe. In *I.G.* II<sup>2</sup>, 350 we find a new addition to the regular formula, for the phrase κατὰ τὸν νόμον appears for the first time. This new formula must refer to a restrictive law of some kind. The nature of the restriction is never defined, and may have varied in different periods. The formulae πλὴν ὧν οἱ νόμοι ἀπαγορεύουσιν (*I.G.* II<sup>2</sup>, 336, 385), καὶ ὧν οἱ νόμοι κελεύουσιν (*I.G.* II<sup>2</sup>, 448) or ὧν οἱ νόμοι λέγουσιν (*I.G.* II<sup>2</sup>, 222, 405) may imply that at certain periods there were several laws covering the naturalization of aliens, though it might be unsafe to press the point that these formulae differ from the phrase κατὰ τὸν νόμον in effect. It is unfortunate that *I.G.* II<sup>2</sup>, 336 is so fragmentary. If we could be certain that the correct reading and restoration is given there (εἶναι δ' αὐτὸν φρατρίας γενέσθαι πλ[η]ν [ὧν οἱ νόμοι ἀπαγορεύουσιν]) we might infer that the phratry was the important point in the new law, and that while a new citizen might enrol in any tribe and deme, the brotherhoods were more exclusive and admission

in some was prohibited, and the new member could only enrol in certain phratries specified by law (καὶ ὧν οἱ νόμοι κελεύουσιν or ὧν οἱ νόμοι λέγουσιν). As was feared in the case of the Samians, new citizens might have been flocking to the same phratry and gaining too much political influence, or, more likely, the state deemed it wiser for these new citizens, who were generally wealthy, to be more evenly distributed over the country. Perhaps the prohibition had to do with border demes, for about the year 325 B.C. the right of aliens to acquire land on the border was forbidden. (Wilhelm, *Wiener Studien*, 1907, p. 1, Thalheim, *P.W. s.v. ἔγκτησις*).

The earliest datable appearance of the restriction appears in 331/0 (*I.G.* II<sup>2</sup>, 350). It is possible that the second decree in *I.G.* II<sup>2</sup>, 336 may be earlier, but Kirchner seems to be correct in placing it after 318/7. From the first decree on this stone we learn that the restriction was not in force in 334 B.C., so we are able to date the enactment of the law with tolerable accuracy, that is, between 334 and 331. We may go a step farther and claim that it was enacted by the oligarchical pro-Macedonian party under Demades, which supplanted Demosthenes and his party after the fall of Thebes.

It may be objected to this theory that *I.G.* II<sup>2</sup>, 222 proves that the restriction was enforced some ten years earlier. But if so it was repealed between 338/7 and 334/3 (*I.G.* II<sup>2</sup>, 237, 336). The history of the period does not warrant this, and we see no good reason why *I.G.* II<sup>2</sup>, 222 should not be placed after 334 B.C. The formula of citizenship certainly implies the later date.

Once the restriction went on the statute-books it proved acceptable to all parties, and though changes may have been made, if that is what we are to infer from the varying formulae, there is only one period where there seems to be any repeal. When the oligarchical democracy came into power in 322/19 B.C. (Ferguson, *Hellenistic Athens*, p. 22) the restriction seems to have been removed for a time. A scrutiny of the gift was then required in its stead (*I.G.* II<sup>2</sup>, 398). Apparently the change was made towards the close of the régime, for some of the inscriptions of the period contain the restriction. The documents which concern our study under the rule of Demetrius of Phalerum, only reaffirm previous gifts of citizenship which seem to have been annulled during the oligarchy of 322-19. Euphron

of Sicyon had been made a citizen in 323 when he had been restricted in his enrolment according to law. In 318 he was readmitted on the same terms, that is, with the same restrictions (*I.G.* II<sup>2</sup>, 448). The other case is that of Archippus who had been given citizenship without restriction in 334, but when he was readmitted after 318, he was not allowed to exercise free choice in regard to his phratry. We may infer that in 334 he had entered a phratry which had since been closed by law to aliens, and Archippus was no longer free to enrol himself therein (*I.G.* II<sup>2</sup>, 336). The phrase seems to have been added as an afterthought because the line is crowded in at the bottom of the decree. Perhaps it is a rider added later when Archippus sought to reënter his old phratry and the Athenians had to amend their decree. It may be that the full phrase would have been added if there had been room, but through lack of space the stonecutter inserted what he considered the essential part of the formula. This is unlikely however, because he could have used part of the preceding line and thus, by crowding a little, worked in the whole phrase.

There is an apparent exception to this law in *I.G.* II<sup>2</sup>, 553, which is dated between 307–5 B.C. In this decree a Neaian is honored, but whatever *ἀδουσίασασθαι* may mean, it does not give the full rights of citizenship as implied in *γράφασθαι* and hence cannot be counted as a real exception. The decree probably confers certain festival privileges only, and does not carry with it the rights of citizenship. In those decrees which confer full citizenship under the rule of Antigonos and Demetrius the restriction always appears (cf. *I.G.* II<sup>2</sup>, 507, 508, 576, 577; probably 570 should be dated after 279 B. C. instead of in 307–1 as placed by Kirchner). Between 301 and 295 B. C. there is only one decree which deals with citizenship (*I.G.* II<sup>2</sup>, 643), and it is so fragmentary that we cannot determine anything beyond the fact that the individuals concerned are apparently reaffirmed in their citizenship.

After the fall of Athens in 294 B.C. we find that the law has been repealed (*I.G.* II<sup>2</sup>, 646). It is impossible to determine the date of the repeal because of our scanty evidence, but it seems more reasonable to place the responsibility on the shoulders of the restored democracy in 301 B.C. than on the tyrant Lachares or on the pro-Macedonian oligarchs in 294. This at least we know. The oligarchs did not revive the restriction after Athens

came into the hands of Demetrius, and we may be sure that they did not enact it during their régime.<sup>1</sup>

When the democracy was restored in 288 B.C. after the expulsion of Demetrius, the laws affecting citizenship were revised. During the democratic régime we find decrees of citizenship almost invariably imposing the restriction. In *I.G.* II<sup>2</sup>, 652 the formula *καθάπερ οἱ πρόγονοι αὐτοῦ* is possibly the old restriction *κατὰ τὸν νόμον* in a new dress. The only exception in the period is *I.G.* II<sup>2</sup>, 654, in which the king, Audoleon, is presented with Athenian citizenship. His royal gifts and still more royal promises to help in recovering Piraeus were enough to give him entrance whither he would. The abrogation of the law in his case supports the theory that the restriction applied to aristocratic phratries.<sup>2</sup> The new inscription which confers citizenship upon Artemidorus *κατὰ τὸν νόμον* is, therefore, to be dated under the democratic government which existed between 288–280 rather than under the democracy of 301–296 B.C.

L. 24. *τοὺς δὲ πρυτάνεις τοὺς πρυτανεύοντας τοῦ Μουνιχιῶνος μηνὸς δοῦναι περὶ αὐτοῦ τὴν ψήφον κτλ.* This is the only example in Attic inscriptions where the *month* of service of the *prytaneis* is given. As the phrase *ἡ πρώτη ἐκκλησία* always means the next meeting of the assembly, we may infer that this decree was passed on the last prytany meeting in Elaphebolion. Since we know from *I.G.* II<sup>2</sup>, 662 that the last prytany meeting in Elaphebolion was held on the last day of the month, we have here additional proof that these two decrees were passed on the self-same day. It is apparent that the name of the tribe which was to hold the prytany for the coming month, was not yet known, else it would have been given. The order in which each tribe held the prytany was not determined at the beginning of the year, as was formerly believed. Nicklin (*Journal of Philology*, 24, p. 76) first suggested that the succeeding prytanizing tribe might have been chosen by lot at the end of the term of office of each retiring prytany, and Ferguson has developed the proof of this (*Athenian Secretaries*,

<sup>1</sup> For the history of the years 295–282 and the dates of the archons in this period see 'Athenian Archons from 294–262 B.C.', which is to appear in *Classical Philology*, July, 1914.

<sup>2</sup> It is possible that 652 and 654 belong to the same year and for some reason the restriction was not imposed in that year. These decrees form the only exceptions during the period of independence between 288 and 280 B.C.

pp. 19 ff.). He has clearly shown that when the phrase *τοὺς πρυτανεύοντας μετὰ τὴν δεῖνα φυλὴν* was used, the decree was passed at the last meeting of the prytany and the tribal name was always that of the prytanizing tribe at the time. When the formula *τοὺς πρυτάνεις τοὺς τῆς δεῖνος φυλῆς* was used, the name was also that of the prytanizing tribe, and the decree belonged to one of the earlier meetings of the prytany. The name of the tribe succeeding to the prytany was never given and this implies that it was never known. The lot for the following prytany could not have been drawn on the first day of the incoming prytany as there is one example of a prytany meeting on the first day of its term (*I.G.* II<sup>2</sup>, 649). It does not seem possible that the necessary preliminaries could have been arranged in a single day, and it is probable that the drawing was the last item of business at the last meeting of the retiring prytany.

L. 27. *τοὺς θεσμοθέτας εἰσαγαγεῖν αὐτῷ τὴν δοκιμασίαν κτλ.* The first appearance of such a formula in decrees conferring citizenship is found in 334 B.C. (*I.G.* II<sup>2</sup>, 336; 358 is probably contemporary, as its formulae are identical and there is no other period in which such a combination is found). When the restriction in the right of enrolment was introduced later (apparently ca. 332 B.C.), the scrutiny before the public courts seems to have been abandoned. It was required once in the years 321-319 B.C. (*I.G.* II<sup>2</sup>, 398), although none of the other decrees of citizenship in this period contain the clause (cf. *I.G.* II<sup>2</sup>, 385, 392, 393, 394, 395). From this we might conclude that this mode of procedure was revived towards the close of the oligarchical régime (*οἱ ἐν τῇ ὀλιγαρχίᾳ πολιτευόμενοι* *I.G.* II<sup>2</sup>, 448). At any rate the scrutiny by the thesmothetae seems to have been abolished on the restoration of the democracy, for the provision does not occur again in decrees of citizenship until the close of the century. The only decree of this class between 318 and 306 B.C. is *I.G.* II<sup>2</sup>, 448, which merely restores to Euphron the citizenship which was taken away from him by the oligarchy. This gift is on the same terms as before, and no scrutiny is required. During the years 317/6-302/1 B.C. the scrutiny of the gift by the thesmothetae was not required while the *ταμίης τοῦ δήμου* was the officer who paid for decrees (*I.G.* II<sup>2</sup>, 508, 558, 576, 577). When he was replaced by *ὁ ἐπὶ τῇ διοικήσει* in 303/2 (see note on line 36) the regulation was again introduced, probably in order to limit the more or less indiscriminate giving which had prevailed in preceding years. It

is probable that this provision was adopted by the party unfriendly to Demetrius in 303 B.C. and, like the other innovations, was unchanged by him when he reestablished his authority. At any rate, the scrutiny of the gift was required in the month Metageitnion in 302/1 B.C. (*I.G.* II<sup>2</sup>, 507). We cannot tell whether the regulation was still retained on the statutes by the moderate democrats who came into power after the battle of Ipsus, for there are no decrees extant from 301 to 296 B.C. which confer the gift of citizenship. In 295/4 B.C. all restrictions in regard to the choice of tribe, deme, and phratry were removed, but the thesmothetae were ordered to bring their scrutiny of the gift of citizenship before the assembly. Until new evidence is forthcoming we cannot decide whether these changes in the laws were due to the legislation of the moderates in 301/0 or to that of the party which came into power on the fall of Lachares. It is reasonable to suppose that the scrutiny was adopted as a substitute procedure when the restrictions in regard to the enrolment of aliens as citizens were removed. The thesmothetae retained this right of scrutiny at least until 272/1 B.C., even though the restrictions of enrolment were revived again at some unknown point in 288/7 B.C. The following decrees belong to the years 295–272 B.C.: *I.G.* II<sup>2</sup>, 646, 648, 652, 654, 663, 667, 682. Since all the honorary decrees within these limits have the formula, we may assume that its use was constant throughout the whole period from 295–272 B.C. From the evidence at hand we cannot definitely exclude the years 301–295 B.C. as a possible date for the new inscription, while, on the other hand, there is no possible objection to dating it in the years 289/8–282/1 B.C.

The purpose of this scrutiny by the thesmothetae is nowhere defined. It was probably an examination into the merits of the case, to determine whether the services to the state were worthy of such a reward, rather than to ascertain the property qualifications of the recipient. In the case of public benefactions, such as gifts of grain or money, such an enquiry by the impecunious state would be most incongruous. But as the regulation to prevent the indiscriminate conferring of citizenship, a protective measure of this kind would serve the purpose well. The recurrence of the phrase *δοκιμασία τῆς δωρεᾶς* supports this view (*I.G.* II<sup>2</sup>, 646, 654, 667; possibly *I.G.* II<sup>2</sup>, 706).

L. 29. *ὅταν πληρῶσιν τὰ δημόσια δικαστήρια.* This is the only occurrence of this variation of the regular formula and is most



important in that this is the only bit of evidence which proves that the public courts dealt with this subject. The usual expression is *ὅταν πρῶτον πληρῶσιν δικαστήριον εἰς ἓνα καὶ πεντακοσίους δικαστάς* (*I.G.* II, 395, etc.). The variation *εἰσαγαγεῖν . . . εἰς τὸ δικαστήριον* is also common (*I.G.* II<sup>2</sup>, 646, 654, etc.). The plural *δικαστήρια*, without the definite article, is found four times (*I.G.* II<sup>2</sup>, 646, *I.G.* II, 396, 402, II, 5, 407 b.). An expression similar to that found in this decree occurs in Aristotle ('*Αθ. Πολ.* LIX, 5), where amongst the various duties of the *thesmothetae* we read *καὶ ἐπικληροῦσιν ταῖς ἀρχαῖς οὗτοι τὰ δικαστήρια τὰ ἴδια καὶ τὰ δημόσια*.

L. 30. *ὅπως* with the subjunctive without *ἄν* is rare in final sentences in Attic decrees. (Three examples in the fourth century, 5 in the third, 8 in the second, Meisterhans, *op. cit.*, p. 253.)

Ll. 31-32. It is also possible to restore *ἀπολήφονται δωρεάς*.

L. 35. This inscription was apparently set up in the precinct of Aglaurus. No other restoration seems possible. *ἐν Ἀγορᾷ* does not suit either the *στοιχηδόν* arrangement or the testimony of the stone, which seems to have a bar of the *lambda* still preserved. *ἐν Ἀγλαύρου* is the only possible restoration, but there is no other inscription known to us which was set up in this precinct, and there is no apparent reason why this decree should be placed there. It is still more puzzling to determine why the stone was brought up from below for this wall when it is clear from the inscriptions (ten in all), broken fragments of architecture, sculpture, reliefs, etc., which make it up, that there was plenty of material on the Acropolis already. One is tempted to believe that a portion of the Acropolis was itself sacred to Aglaurus—possibly near the stairway which led to the lower precinct. At any rate, if the stone was carried up from below, the location of the sanctuary near the cave of Pan and the western stairway (Weller *A.J.A.* 1908, p. 68) seems much more reasonable than the site below the Erechtheum (Judeich *Topographie von Athen*, p. 272).

L. 37. *τοὺς ἐπὶ τῇ διοικήσει*. The restoration is certain since the stoichedon arrangement requires it, and portions of the *sigma* of the article still remain on the stone. The phrase *ἐπὶ τῇ διοικήσει* appears in inscriptions first in *I.G.* II<sup>2</sup>, 463 (307/6) Wachsmuth, *Die Stadt Athen*, Vol. 1, pp. 615-6; Ferguson, *op. cit.*, p. 113). Habron, the son of Lycurgus, is named as the officer *ἐπὶ τῇ διοικήσει* and happens to be the only one whom we know by name. Whatever his duties in 307/6 B.C., they do not interfere with

those of the *ταμίας τοῦ δήμου* who pays for the recording of the decree. The latter officer still retained this duty at least as late as 305/4 (*I.G.* II<sup>2</sup>, 478, 479), and it is probable that he was not displaced until some time during, or at the end of, 303/2, as *I.G.* II<sup>2</sup>, 558 was not passed until this year since the formula regarding the value of the crown in this decree has the phrase *κατὰ τὸν νόμον*. *I.G.* II<sup>2</sup>, 488, line 26, may be restored as follows: [τὸν ἐπὶ τῇ διοικήσει: Δ] Δ[Δ: δραχμὰς as well as with the phrase [*ταμίαν τοῦ δήμου*]. This inscription therefore cannot be used as evidence one way or the other. The next datable inscription shows that the steward of the people was displaced by the officer in charge of the administration in the month Anthesterion in 302/1 B.C. (*I.G.* II<sup>2</sup>, 500, cf. *Οἰκονόμος*, 'Εφ. 'Αρχ. 1910, pp. 401 ff.). But he again is displaced by ὁ *ταμίας τοῦ δήμου* in the month Scirophorion of the same year (*I.G.* II<sup>2</sup>, 505). This change of officers in the same year is unusual, but this was a season of peculiar storm and stress in Athenian politics, and such changes are to be expected with the changing complexion of the party in control of the government (cf. Ferguson, *Klio*, V, pp. 155-179). It is probable that we should date the first disappearance of the *ταμίας τοῦ δήμου* in 303/2 as a part of the reforms instituted by the party in opposition to Demetrius which gained control of the government during his absence in the Peloponnese (cf. Ferguson, *Priests of Asklepios*, pp. 141-2). The new party was soon forced out and Demetrius reestablished Stratocles at the head of affairs. He made no changes in the election of officers, however, and the officer ἐπὶ τῇ διοικήσει continued to pay for the cost of decrees for the short remaining period of Demetrius' control of Athens. Towards the close of 302/1 B.C. there is a return to the old order of things, for we find the *ταμίας τοῦ δήμου* reinstated and this officer paid the cost of the decree (*I.G.* II, 505). This is the last appearance of the *ταμίας τοῦ δήμου* in the inscriptions. The political creed of the party which relieved the minister ἐπὶ τῇ διοικήσει of the expenses in connection with the public records at the end of 302/1 can only be conjectured. Since no reference is made to Demetrius in *I.G.* II<sup>2</sup>, 505 we may reasonably infer that the party was not friendly to their former overlord, and it is probable that they gained the leadership shortly after Demetrius left to join Antigonos. Though they changed the duties of the minister of the administration, they were not strong enough to maintain their position, and in

the following year Stratocles was apparently reestablished. At any rate he was mover of the decree on the twenty-eighth of Metageitnion in 301/0 B.C. (*I.G.* II<sup>2</sup>, 640). This implies his return to the leadership. Whether he made any changes in the financial boards or not is uncertain, since evidence is lacking. His tenure of office, however, was brought to an abrupt close by the battle of Ipsus and the defeat of Demetrius. The moderate democrats who then came into office proceeded to revise the constitution in a thorough manner (Ferguson, *Hellenistic Athens*, pp. 124 ff.). We cannot tell whether these changes were put into effect immediately after the battle of Ipsus or at the beginning of the next year, but it is probable that they were made at once. At any rate the *ταμίαι τοῦ δήμου* was replaced by a board and never reappears in inscriptions again. In the year 299/8 we find that the cost of the inscription was paid by *ὁ ἐξεταστής καὶ οἱ τριττάρχαι* (*I.G.* II<sup>2</sup>, 641, 643). These officers were apparently assigned this duty in 301/0 B.C. by the moderate democrats and continued to perform it probably until the administration of Lachares in 295 B.C. It is not clear whether Lachares made any changes in the administration of financial affairs. The decrees passed during his régime are too fragmentary to determine the point. It would be reasonable to assume that he would prefer to vest the administration in the hands of an individual rather than a board. After Athens fell in the spring of 294 and a pro-Macedonian party came into power, we find that the minister of the administration pays for the cost of the decree while the *exetastes* and *tritttyarchs* allot the money for a statue (*I.G.* II<sup>2</sup>, 646; cf. 648). These officials and their duties may be a survival from the previous régime, but it cannot be proved as yet.<sup>1</sup> There is no evidence that any change was made at the end of the year 295/4 and it is practically certain that these officers remained in power until the fall of Demetrius and the revolt of Athens in 288. When the democracy returned to power in that year (Tarn, *Antigonos Gonatas*, p. 92), they recalled Demochares from exile and probably made him the chairman of the college, *οἱ ἐπὶ τῇ διοικήσει*, which they reestablished. In all the decrees during the democratic régime this board allots the funds (*μερίσαι*) for recording and setting up the inscriptions. We may safely assume, therefore, that the college existed continuously from 288 to 280/79 B.C.

<sup>1</sup> Ferguson, ('Athenian Politics of the Early Third Century,' *Klio*, V, pp. 171 ff.) treats this period somewhat differently.

Since there is no evidence for the college οἱ ἐπὶ τῇ διοικήσει in 301-295 B.C., we cannot date the new inscription in that period without revising the history of the financial boards at that time. On the other hand, there is ample evidence for the existence of the college in 288-0 B.C. The history of this board gives the strongest support yet found for dating *I.G.* II<sup>2</sup>, 663 in the later period.

L. 37. The usual phrase τὸ γενόμενον ἀνάλωμα was not added by the stonecutter. There is no trace of any letters after διοικήσει.

The reference to King Lysimachus in lines 2 and 17 dates this decree in the years 301/0-295/4 or 288/7-282/1 B.C.<sup>1</sup> By studying the various formulae in the body of the decree, we are practically compelled to assign it to the later period. If we should date the inscription in the earlier period, we must assume that the restrictions of registration in gifts of citizenship were not removed in 301 but continued to exist and were abolished somewhere between 297 and 295 B.C. and that this abolition was not due to party changes. While the restriction was still in effect, the δοκιμασία of the gift was added. But it is much easier to believe that the latter was required only when the former was abolished, as seems to be the case in 295/4. Still greater difficulty is introduced into the history of the board ἐπὶ τῇ διοικήσει if the decree is assigned to the earlier period. We must in that case assume that the board οἱ ἐπὶ τῇ διοικήσει was established in 301/0, and shared the functions of the board which is called ὁ ἐξεταστής καὶ οἱ τριττάρχοι in some ill-defined way during the following five years, for in the new inscription the former board allots (μερίσαι) the cost of the inscription, while in *I.G.* II<sup>2</sup>, 641 (299/8) the latter officers pay (δοῦναι) the expenses. Such a confusion of duties might be justified from the history of the year 302/1 B.C. but would lack warrant in the later period, because there were no political upheavals at that time to explain the change. Furthermore, we should need to assume that the officer ὁ ἐπὶ τῇ διοικήσει was reestablished under the administration of Lachares, and that the plural board came back into power again in the following year. The accumulative evidence of these formulae tends to establish the date of this inscription within the years 288/7-282/1. At this point the evidence of *I.G.* II<sup>2</sup>, 662 becomes available for a more exact dating. The similarity in subject matter and in wording is so great that there can be no doubt that they belong very close together. From the frag-

<sup>1</sup> Ferguson, *op. cit.* pp. 144 ff., cf. *Classical Philology*, 1914, l.c.

ment preserved of *I.G.* II<sup>2</sup>, 662, it is seen that the decree was passed on the thirtieth day of the ninth prytany on the thirtieth day of the ninth month. Month and prytany therefore coincide and we may make the following restoration:

[ἐπ' . . . . . ἄρχοντος ἐπὶ τῆς Κεκ]ροπίδος ἐνάτης π-  
[ρυτανείας Ἐλαφβολιῶνος ἔνει καὶ] νέαι τριακοστῇ  
[τῆς πρυτανείας κτλ.]

If we exclude the earlier period, there is only one name in the later years which can be restored and that is Diocles. Professor Kirchner, in dating *I.G.* II<sup>2</sup>, 662, assigned it to the archonship of Meneceles restoring ἐπὶ Μενεκλέου instead of ἐπὶ Μενεκλέους. While this spelling can be justified, we do not believe that this date can be accepted. In the spring of 272 Lysimachus had already murdered his son, and the whole civilized world, shocked, repudiated his friendship and alliance. Athens could not have been any exception. She turned to Asia for help against Antigonus, and perhaps dreamed that her island kingdom might yet be won back in a measure (*Classical Philology*, 1914, *l.c.*). The cordial relations between Lysimachus and Athens indicated in *I.G.* II<sup>2</sup>, 662, 663 do not accord with the situation at Athens as we understand it in 282. It is very doubtful if the archon Meneceles is correctly dated by Kirchner in 283/2. The point is disputed but probably he should be placed in 281/0. In that case Lysimachus was dead long before the decrees were passed.<sup>1</sup> A third argument against dating *I.G.* II<sup>2</sup>, 662 in the archonship of Meneceles is found in *I.G.* II<sup>2</sup>, 664. If the latter inscription be restored, no arrangement of prytanies can be found to agree with the scheme given under *I.G.* II<sup>2</sup>, 662—unless we assume a violation of the *stoichedon* arrangement. All these considerations are to be urged against dating *I.G.* II<sup>2</sup>, 662 in 283/2 in the archonship of Meneceles. There is none to be urged against placing this and the new decree in the archonship of Diocles. The *stoichedon* arrangement, the formulae employed, the arrangement of the prytanies, and the historical content of the inscriptions all point to the archonship of Diocles. Both of these inscriptions were passed accordingly on the thirtieth day of Elaphebolion in the year 288/7 B.C.

PRINCETON.

ALLAN CHESTER JOHNSON.

<sup>1</sup> For a discussion of this whole problem see *Classical Philology*, 1914, *l.c.* I have no new arguments to add, and to avoid repetition I refer those interested in the subject to the proof given there.